

TI-31434

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-9, 11-18, 20, 21, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Neukermans et al. The Examiner states that Neukermans disclosed a micromirror array assembly comprising a plurality of micromirrors arranged in an array, each supported by hinges and gimbals in a frame formed in a monolithic element, and each micromirror being individually rotatable about two axes; a plurality of permanent magnets, at least one permanent magnet coupled to each of the plurality of micromirrors in the array; and other elements. The Examiner specifically recited figures 3 and 28C and in the specification columns 9, lines 35-62 and column 35, lines 50-65.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The array of micromirrors in Neukermans does not utilize electromagnetic means to actuate the micromirrors, the Examiner's statement is to the contrary notwithstanding. Referring to column 6, lines 34-46, and column 15, lines 36-40, it is clear that Neukerman's et al. uses electrostatic means to deflect each of the mirrors. The electromagnetic means referred to by the Examiner which is discussed in column 35, lines 50-65, are for electromagnetic means to translate the lens along the longitudinal axes (144) which is very different from rotating the mirrors about a pair of hinges.

In view of the fact that this is a '102 rejection, the absence of permanent magnets and coil drivers for each of the mirrors as recited in the present claims, distinguishes the present invention over the reference and the Examiner's rejection must fail.

The Examiner rejects claims 22-27 and 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neukermans et al. The Examiner rejects claims 10 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neukermans et al. in view of

S/N 10/024,321


Page 2 of 3

TI-31434

Garverick et al. These claims are all dependent claims. The patentability of the parent claims having been shown above, these claims are patentable for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By   
William B. Kempler  
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel  
Reg. No. 28,228  
(972) 917-5452

S/N 10/024,321

Page 3 of 3